



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,940	06/29/2006	Moshe Basol	7044-X06-007	2604
27317 7590 05/05/2009 Fleit Gibbons Gutman Bongini & Bianco PL 21355 EAST DIXIE HIGHWAY SUITE 115 MIAMI, FL 33180				
EXAMINER				
SQUIRES, BRETT S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2431				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/05/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/596,940

**Applicant(s)**

BASOL ET AL.

**Examiner**

BRETT SQUIRES

**Art Unit**

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 2-10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claim 21, which claims 2-10 depend from either directly or indirectly, has been amended to recite the term "portals." This term is not recited in the specification, however the examiner does note that the specification does recite website. The examiner further notes while the term "portal," does have a similar definition to that of the term "website," the two definitions are not identical. Accordingly, the subject matter included in definition for the term "portal," but not included in the definition for the term "website," introduces new matter into the application.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5, 7-10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 5 and 15 recite the limitation "the identification code," in pages 3-4 of amendment filed February 17, 2009. Claims 5 and 15 depend from independent claims 21, 21 and dependent claims 4, 14, respectively, none of the claims that claim 5 and 15 depend from recite "an identification code," accordingly there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the identification code," in claims 5 and 15.
6. Claims 7-10 recite the limitation "the identified session," in pages 3-4 of amendment filed February 17, 2009. Claim 7-10 depend directly from independent claim 21, which does not recite "an identified session," and instead recites "an original session," accordingly there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the identified session," in claims 7-10.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US 2004/0210771).
- Regarding Claims 8, 18, 21 and 22:

Wood discloses a security system for real time monitoring and controlling of communication sessions within a network server environment ("Providing a persistent session in a networked information environment includes associating a unique session identifier with a set of access requests originating from a client entity and maintaining the unique session identifier across a credential level change" See paragraph 11), wherein each original session enables operating a sequence of processes including operations carried out in the server environment ("Session continuity means the maintenance of coherent session state across one or more interaction between an entity and an information environment." See paragraph 45), the system having at least one server ("A secure information system includes plural information resources host on one or servers coupled via a communication network to a client entity." See paragraph 15) enabling to communicate with a multiplicity of client users ("Client Browser" See fig. 1 ref. no. 170 and "In general a wide variety of entities, including human users operation browser and/or non-browser client applications as well as automated agents or systems, may interact with enterprise applications and/or resources 190 and the security architecture as described herein." See paragraph 41) via at least one communication network ("Communication network" See paragraph 15), wherein each client user enables accessing portals and operating sessions in the portals ("A variety of information resource identification schemes, such as by Uniform Resource Locator (URL), resource address, identifier or namespace designation, may be employed." See paragraph 41), and at least one module operated by the at least one server ("Gatekeeper," "Log-In," "Authentication," "Authorization," "Identification," and "Session"

See fig. 1 ref. nos. 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, and 160), wherein the at least one module enables associating a session ID to the original session of the client user ("If no session token is present or if a session token is invalid, gatekeeper/entry handler component 110 establishes a new session." See paragraph 47) and to each process in the sequence of processes operated by the original session, ("Gatekeeper functionality (e.g. in gatekeeper/entry handler component 110) checks whether a session is already associated with the incoming request." See paragraphs 44-47) wherein the session ID enables determining an authorization level ("Authenticated Trust Level" See paragraph 46) of session in accordance with predefined determination rules ("The mapping of login credential types and authentication mechanisms to trust levels is influenced by environment information such as time of request, source of request, connection speed, and/or client application (e.g., browser) environment information." See paragraphs 37-38), where the determination rules refer to the properties of the original session ("Security requirements are expressed in terms of trust levels and login component 120 obtains login credentials for an entity requesting access to one of the enterprise applications and/or resources 190." See paragraph 35), wherein each session ID is related to the manner in which the client user has operated the original session ("The login credentials obtained are selected from a set of credential types that, if authenticated are sufficient to achieve the trust level requirement of an application or information resource to be accessed." See paragraph 35), wherein each process in the sequence is associated in real time with the same session ID of the original session enabling the module to continuously monitor operation of each process of each client

user ("In the case of a pre-existing session, the signed session credential may be obtained using a received session token." See paragraph 48), while the at least one server enables operating the processes of each original session according to the authorization level related to the session ID ("Authorization component 140 may base its allow, redirect, or refuse response on a current trust level previously associated with the signed session credentials." See paragraph 48).

Regarding Claims 2 and 12:

Wood discloses a filtering module installed at the at least one server for blocking unauthorized processes in accordance with determined authorization level ("Authorization component 140 responds with an allow, redirect, or refuse response based on the sufficiency of a current trust level." See paragraph 48).

Regarding Claims 3 and 13:

Wood discloses at least one agent installed on the at least one server, the agent enable correlating between processes and sessions on different servers ("Gatekeeper and entry handler component 110 provides an entry point for external client applications requesting access to enterprise applications and/or resources 190, including e.g., information resources 191, 192, 193, for which access management is provided by the security architecture." See paragraph 33).

Regarding Claims 7 and 17:

Wood discloses the identified session properties are sign in parameters ("Login component 120 operating in conjunction with gatekeeper/entry handler component 110

and other components of the security architecture, provides a single sign-on interface for access to enterprise applications and/or resources 190." See paragraph 35).

Regarding Claims 9 and 19:

Wood discloses the identified session properties are hyperlink session address type parameters ("In some configuration, information on line speed, origination point (e.g., inside or outside of a corporate network), browser type, encryptions capability, number of hops latency, system type, etc. may be gather." See paragraph 43).

Regarding Claim 10 and 20:

Wood discloses the original session is identified according to a unique Transmission Control Protocol port ID ("For network connection, similar environment information may be obtained from incoming requests themselves or based on a particular entry point (e.g. a particular router or port)." See paragraph 43).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wood et al. (US 2004/0210771) in view of Carter et al. (US 2003/0051026).

Wood discloses the above stated security architecture for providing access to enterprise applications and resources based on a session token's current trust level (See paragraph 35).

Wood does not disclose each process has a process information vector wherein the session ID of the original session is added to the process information vector of each process in the sequence related to the original session.

Carter discloses a network surveillance and security system for monitoring and protecting a computer network that uses a process identification vector to associate a user ID with a unique process ID (See paragraph 342 and 363).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the security architecture disclosed by Wood to include using a process identification vector to associate a session ID with a unique process ID such as that taught by Carter in order to enable the utilization of matrices to track and control information and processes (See Carter paragraph 339).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-10 and 12-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BRETT SQUIRES** whose telephone number is (571) 272-8021. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am - 6:00pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BS/

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431